DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 324 369 TM 015 644

AUTHOR Smith, Joe Michael
TITLE A Comparative Study of the State Regulations for and the Operation of the New Jersey Provisional Teacher Certification Program.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 16-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Alternative Teacher Certification; Beginning Teachers; College Students; Comparative Analysis; *Conventional Instruction; Diaries; Elementary Secondary Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Evaluation; School Districts; *State Programs; State Standards; State Surveys; *Student Teachers; Teacher Workshops
IDENTIFIERS New Jersey; *Provisional Certification; *Teacher Candidates

ABSTRACT

The Phase 1 induction training received by provisional teachers from their local school districts and the student teaching experience of Trenton State College students were studied. Under the New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program, the professional education of the alternate route provisional teachers is provided by the local school district and the State Department of Education. This study focused on the initial 20-day seminar and practicum training program conducted by the local school districts. Data were obtained from a survey consisting of a daily log of 10 categories of activity kept by the teacher candidates. The data were gathered for alternate route teachers in September, October, and November of 1989, and for student teachers in January and February of 1990. Of the 151 people seeking alternate certification, 73 returned completed daily logs. A second survey administered to 134 provisional teachers established that 63 had no prior teaching experience. The data indicated that the provisional teachers were not receiving the training required by the state. Supervision was not as complete as had been mandated, and provisional teachers began to teach without the anticipated gradual assumption of duties. When data on program implementation were compared with data on traditional student teaching, it was evident that the districts did provide support and training for traditional student teachers (n=53), but that they did not provide equivalent support and training for provisional teachers in the alternate certification program. Eight data tables and a 48-item list of references are included. Appendix A contains the weekly log instructions and the survey instrument. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

JOE M. SMITH

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED324369

A Comparative Study of the State Regulations for and the Operation of the New Jersey Provisional Teacher Certification Program

Presented To:
The American Educational Research Association
Annual Conference
Boston, Massachusetts
April 17, 1990

Prepared by
Joe Michael Smith, Ph D
Department of Educational Administration
and Secondary Education
School of Education
Trenton State College
Trenton, New Jersey 08650-4700

©
1990

TM015644

A Comparative Study of the State Regulations for and the Operation of the New Jersey Provisional Teacher Certification Program

Abstract

This study analyzes the Phase I induction training received by provisional teachers from their local school districts and the student teaching experience of Trenton State College students. The study shows that the provisional teachers are not receiving the training required by the State Board of Education. The study analyzes the experiences of provisional teachers and student teachers in terms of the rate of assumption of full-time teaching responsibilities; the amount and type of supervision provided; the amount and type of training provided; and the source of training supervision.

Introduction and Objectives

Alternative teacher certification programs became part of the educational process across the nation between 1984 and 1986 (Adelman, 1986). A great many articles were written about the meaning of alternate route and which types of programs were acceptable and which types of programs lacked appropriate quality (Reform/Change, 1989 & Teacher Certification, 1989). In the summer of 1985 the New Jersey State Department of Education initiated a radically different teacher certification program, the Provisional Teacher Program. It is different in that the professional education of the provisional teachers is provided by the local school district and the State Department of Education. There is a 20 day on-the-job training period conducted by the school district which then qualifies the provisional teacher to take complete charge of the classroom. At the end of the first year of teaching the successful alternate route teacher is awarded a life-time certificate. This program was conceived and implemented as a true certification alternative because its premise for success is not related to teacher shortages but to teacher candidate quality (Cooperman & Klagholz, 1985). A study of the New Jersey program is also important because President Bush has requested $25 million from Congress to replicate the program nationwide.

The New Jersey Alternate Route professional education program has two distinct components: an on-site component, i.e., at the school-site where the provisional teacher is working, and an academic component of 200 hours provided by the State Department of Education. The on-site training program consists of three phases: the first 20 days, the next 10 weeks, and the final five months. This study focused exclusively on the 20 day seminar/practicum training program which is conducted by the local school district

because this is the primary professional instructional component. The other two phases combined total 15 instructional periods of observation.

The teacher certification program at Trenton State College has evolved from a competency based program with a strong programmatic emphasis upon the integration of field experiences and academic course work (Durkin & Smith, 1980). There are three distinct field experiences: Sophomore Professional Experience in which the students are in the schools for a minimum of 30 hours to a maximum of 60 hours in one semester; Junior Professional Experience in which the students are in the schools three (3) or four (4) half-days per week for 15 weeks with a seminar the remaining day(s) for a total of 300 hours of practicum/seminar; and Senior Student Teaching in which the students are in the schools all day for fifteen weeks plus attend a two (2) hour seminar one night per week for a total of 555 hours.

The objectives of this study are as follows:

1. to determine the amount and type of supervision provided by the program to each programs' participants;
2. to determine the type and amount of training given by the program to each programs' participants;
3. to determine which program design integrates best with the school districts capabilities;
4. to determine the level of compliance with the New Jersey Administrative Code 6:11-5, 6:11-8.2.

Review of the Literature

The literature on alternative routes to certification focused primarily upon the quick integration of classroom teaching duties and some form of pedagogic instruction. There has been extensive current research on various types of internships (Teacher Interns, 1989). Much of the positive response to alternate routes came as a result of serious concerns with the growing use of Emergency Certificates (Williamson, 1984). The move toward alternative programs was envisioned by many educators as a necessity rather than a desirable new program (Ashburn, 1984). Alternative Programs were viewed by some as an opportunity to create a new, effective program for people in career changes (Saunders & Smith, 1986). The variations in programs caused the Association of Teacher Educators to publish a booklet for standards to be followed in establishing an alternate route teacher certification program (1989).

New Jersey's Commissioner of Education, Dr. Saul Cooperman, has a minimalist view of what training is necessary to become a teacher while the professional

educational community believes there is value to the study of and training in pedagogy. The ideas and beliefs supporting each side of these fundamental differences were discussed in a paper written by Martin Haberman (1984).

There is research which has demonstrated that secondary school pupils who had education major student teachers out-performed secondary school pupils who had non-education major student teachers by 10% on achievement tests (Denton &Smith, 1984). There is research which showed that the achievement rates of pre-schoolers who are taught by certified teachers in the field were higher than those students who have teachers who are not certified in the field but are certified in other areas (Hill, 1980). There is more generic research on training teachers in specific performance areas and correlations with student achievement (Rosenshine, 1983). Correlations of specific training techniques and student achievement in mathematics and science have been conducted with positive results (Van der Sijde, 1987; Miller, 1981). The correlation between teacher training and student achievement is sufficiently valid that Virginia developed a competency based certification system upon the research (Medley, 1985). The correlation of affective behaviors of teachers who had been trained and student achievement has also been compiled (Hunt, 1987).

A significant compilation of research on the relationship between the teacher's knowledge and use of discipline-specific pedagogy and student achievement is a text edited by Jere Brophy, *Advances in Research on Teaching, Volume I* (1989). The essential requirements which should be learned by a novice to be ready to begin teaching in the profession is presented in a text edited by Maynard C. Reynolds, *Knowledge Base for the Beginning Teacher* (1989). This work, sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, relies exclusively upon a research base to establish its requirements. The New Jersey Alternate Route uses a 14 page document created by a committee in two days which was chaired by Ernest Boyer (Boyer, 1984) to direct the professional training of its program. The "Boyer Report" uses no research citations to support its recommendations and conclusions. (This document is used as the standard to which all New Jersey teacher education programs must adhere for State certification.)

New Jersey's alternate route was intended to attract the liberal arts graduate and put that person into the classroom with the minimal amount of training (Cooperman, 1983). In a review of the literature available in ERIC (ERIC, 1967-1989), Texas was found to be the only other state that has made the local school district the sole agent responsible for training and recommending persons for certification (Lutz & Hutton, 1989). California has a program in which the local school district may be

responsible for certifying a person who wants to become a teacher but the program must be in cooperation with, and approved by, an institution of higher education with an approved teacher certification program in the field (Oliver & McKibbin, 1985). The program length is two to three years and is restricted to departmentalized schools, grades 6-8, and to high schools. South Carolina has also developed an alternative teacher certification program (Graham & Million, 1986). The program is restricted to areas of teaching which have declared "shortages" and are required to be in cooperation with an institution of higher education. The latter two programs typify most existing programs.

A research report on the New Jersey Alternate Route Program found that "training was not entirely sufficient" for the programs participants (Gray & Lynn, 1988). A survey conducted by the New Jersey Education Association found that a significant number of alternate route teachers reported that they did not receive the required training services from the local school district (NJEA, 1986). A different survey conducted by the New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association found 45% of the school districts reporting problems with the 20 day practicum/seminar program (Provisional, 1986). The New York Times reported a case study where an alternate route teacher did not receive any of the 20 day training (Friendly, 1986). The State Department of Education was still willing to certify him if he paid his $400 for training which he did not receive. He refused to pay and was not certified. A two year study (1987, 1988) of the New Jersey Alternate Route found that the Phase I training component conducted by the school districts was minimal to non-existent for the vast majority of alternate route teachers (Smith, 1990). The study showed that the Alternate Route Program was not in compliance with the NJ Administrative Code.

These findings which indicate a deficient training program for alternate route teachers especially in field training are supported by a nationwide study of various alternative programs (Darling-Hammond, 1989). The conflict between the intended policy of training on-the-job versus the lack of training was noted in an earlier study by Darling-Hammond (1988). The successful completion rates of people who enter the alternate route programs may vary widely (Kuhles, 1990; Lutz & Hutton, 1989).

Another set of literature provides positions about alternative routes (Galluzo & Ritter, 1986; Culver, et al., 1986; Roth, 1986) but contains no research evidence. Journal articles which review research of training systems find that formal training systems are more effective than non-training systems (Hullin-Austin, 1986; Banks & Necco, 1986).

Method

The data were gathered for alternate route teachers in September, October, and November of 1989 and for student teachers in January and February of 1990. The surveys were given to and collected from alternate route teachers at regional training centers conducted at colleges throughout the State (Kean College, Trenton State College, Glassboro State College and Fairleigh-Dickinson University). Student teacher surveys were collected at the weekly seminars at the respective Colleges. Participation in the research was voluntary. Because the centers are located throughout the entire State, there was a representation of urban, suburban, and rural districts, and public, private, and parochial schools with a total of 141 different schools or school districts for the alternate route. The population in the Fall of '89 was 288 (*The Provisional Teacher Program*, 1989). Teaching assignments ranged from early childhood to high school. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics.

The student teachers were in 70 different schools. The range was from early childhood through high school teaching. The instructional areas represented match those of the alternate route candidates: early childhood, elementary, math, science, social studies, English, and health/physical education.

Source of Data

The data for this study come from a survey designed to describe the training and instructional experiences of the provisional teacher during the first 20 days of the practicum/seminar training program and of the traditional student teacher during the first 20 days of student teaching. The survey consists of a set of directions and a daily log to be kept with 10 categories for each day. The logs were turned in every week or within one week of completing the 20 day program. Those logs which did not meet this standard were not used. Of the 151 alternate route people who completed logs, 73 were perfect for all four weeks of the periods. Of the 78 which were not used, the problems were unclear data in all four weeks (4), three weeks complete (15), one or two weeks complete (41), and completed the 20 days prior to the fall (7). A scan of the un-used logs showed no material differences in information with the 73 that were used. Of the 71 student teachers who completed logs 53 were perfect for all four weeks of the periods. Of the 18 which were not used, the problems were only unclear data in all four weeks (2), three weeks complete (9), one or two weeks complete (7).

The surveys asked the participants to keep records on the amount of time they taught each day, the amount of time they observed others teach, and whether these observations were structured or unstructured. In the third category the provisional and

student teachers recorded how often they were observed teaching, the position of the observer, the conduct of a pre-observation conference, and of a critique. For alternate route teachers the number of seminars (meetings) and amount of time spent with the school based Support Team was also maintained. Student teachers were required to attend seminars at the College.

Definition of Terms

The definitions of terms were developed to provide some standardization for analyzing the results. All time was converted to periods with five periods being the full-time teaching load. A period is equivalent to 45 minutes of teaching and is rounded up to or down to the closest appropriate number of periods.

The definitions for compliance and non-compliance relative to the amount of teaching a provisional teacher does within the 20 day period of practicum/seminar is derived from three sources: 1) the State Department of Education's interpretation of good practice; NJ Administrative Code 6:11-5.5; 2) a panel of experts* who were independently polled for the interpretation; and 3) the interpretation given by two independent school district committees (Highland Park Schools and West Windsor/Plainsboro Schools) who had worked with the New Jersey Alternate Route. The definition for good practice in supervision is derived from the State Department of Education's definition as given to the colleges in New Jersey to supervise their students in conducting teacher education programs (Cooperman, 1986), from the New Jersey Administrative Code 6:11-7, and the New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program Handbook; Appendix J (1989).

The Handbook (New Jersey, 1989) makes a distinction between teachers with experience and those without experience in applying a guideline for when a provisional teacher may begin teaching full-time. A provisional teacher who has not had any prior teaching experience is not permitted to begin teaching full-time on the first day in the program. It is recommended that the first full day of teaching not occur until at least the second or third week. A teacher who has had prior teaching experience is permitted to teach full-time the first day. In both cases the teacher must be under the constant supervision of an experienced teacher, supervisor, or administrator. Compliance will be analyzed in terms of the percentage of teachers teaching full-time the first day versus the percentage of teachers who have had previous teaching experience. Compliance will

*The panel of experts consisted of one urban elementary principal, one suburban middle school principal, and one high school science department chair who supervised alternate route teachers.

also be analyzed in terms of the amount of supervision provided to the provisional teachers.

The State Department of Education has not defined the term, "teaching experience." It is unclear if this means a person who has been a part-time substitute teacher, taught Sunday School for 10 years, or any number of other experiences which one might call teaching. In the Provisional Teacher Program the judgment appears to be left to the local school

Definitions:

1. One period equals 45 minutes
2. Five periods of teaching equals full-time teaching in one day; 21 periods or more equals full-time teaching for a five day week.
3. A "Pre-Observation conference" is a discussion of the lesson to be observed and takes place between the provisional teacher and the observer prior to the observation.
4. A "critique" is a post-observation conference, of any length, of the particular lesson observed.
5. An "Instructional Meeting" is any meeting provided by the local school to give instruction in the profession to the provisional teacher. For Student Teachers, the seminar at the College is the instructional meeting.
6. "Observed" is defined as having a school professional in the classroom who is a certified teacher and is assigned by the principal to work with the provisional teacher with either person in charge of the lesson. (This term may be used interchangeably with "supervised.")
7. "Prior Teaching Experience" is being under contract to teach a class for one full year.

Results

Amount of Teaching and
the Amount of Supervision

	Total Per'ds Taught	Total Per'ds Observed	Total Periods Not Observed	Compl'nce With Code	Mode % Observed
Alternate Rte Tchers (N=73)	6532 mean of 89	1389(21%)	5143(79%)	No	0%
Student Tchers (N=53)	2419 mean of 46	1901(79%)	518(21%)	Yes	100%

Table 1

Table 1, row 1, presents the amount of periods that alternate route teachers taught, the number of periods in which they were supervised, the number of periods in which they were not supervised, whether this ratio puts them in compliance with the New Jersey Administrative Code which governs the program, and the mode for the percentage of periods observed while teaching. Column 1 shows that they taught 653[illegible] periods during the 20 day practicum/seminar for a mean number of 89. The Code requires that the teachers be observed 100% of the time. Column 2 shows that they were observed 1389 periods (21%). Column 3, "Total Periods Not Observed" shows the Alternate Route teachers were left alone without supervision for 5143 periods (79%). Column 4, "Compliance with the Code," shows that there was no compliance with the Code by the program as a whole during the four (4) weeks or 20 days of the practicum/seminar. The last column shows that the mode for the percentage of periods observed while teaching was 0%.

Row 2 represents the 53 student teachers. Column 1 shows that they taught 2419 periods with a mean of 46. Column 2 shows that they were observed 1901 periods (79%). Column 3 shows that they were not observed 518 periods (21%). Column 4 has a "yes" because there is no requirement that the cooperating teacher be in the room 100% of the time. There is a requirement that the college professor observe once every 2 weeks which was done in every case. Column 5 shows that the mode for the percentage of periods observed while teaching was 100%.

Cumulative Supervision Results for All Four Weeks

	Tchg F/T	Never Ob'd	Sup Less Than 1/day	Sup'd 100%	Sup'd 51% or more
Alt Rte Tchrs	56 (77%)	17 (23%)	49 (67%)	3 (4%)	9 (12%)
Student Tchrs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	21 (40%)	42 (80%)

Table 2

Table 2 compares alternate route training with student teacher practices in 5 cumulative categories. Column 1 shows the total number of people in each group who taught full-time in all four weeks. Column 2 shows the number of people in each group who were never observed once in the four weeks. Column 3 shows the number of people in each group who were not observed at least once on each day that the person taught. Column 4 shows the people who supervised every period in which they taught. Column 5 shows the people who were supervised in at least 51% of all the periods taught.

Alternate Route Teaching and The Rate of Supervision

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4
Alt Tchr Tching	71 (97%)	72(97%)	73(100%)	73(100%)
# Teaching Full-Time	56(77%)	59 (80%)	60(82%)	68(93%)
Sup'd less than 1/Day	52(71%)	50(68%)	50(68%)	55(75%)
Supervised 100%	9(12%)	6(8%)	6(8%)	6(8%)
In Compliance	11(15%)	7(10%)	6(8%)	6(8%)
Never Ob'd This Week	27 (37%)	29 (40%)	31 (42%)	30 (41%)

Table 3

Tables 3 and 4 show six categories by row for each week of the four week training period. Row 1 shows the number and percentage of people in the study who are teaching in each week. Row 2 shows the number teaching full time. Row 3 shows the number who were not supervised at least once each day they taught. Row 4 shows the number of those who were teaching who were supervised every period they taught. Row 5 shows the number of program participants in compliance with the program's guidelines. Row 6 shows the number of those who taught who were never observed that week.

Student Teachers Teaching and The Rate of Supervision

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4
St Tchrs Tching	41 (77%)	51 (96%)	53 (100%)	53 (100%)
# Teaching Full-Time	0 (0%)	4 (8%)	1 (2%)	16 (30%)
Sup'd less than 1/Day	2 (4%)	2 (4%)	2 (4%)	6 (11%)
Supervised 100%	36 (88%)	41 (80%)	30 (57%)	29 (55%)
In Compliance*	100 (100%)	100 (100%)	100 (100%)	100 (100%)
Never Ob'd This Week	2 (5%)	1 (2%)	4(8%)	3 (6%)

Table 4

*Neither the New Jersey Administrative Code nor State Department of Education's regulations have a direct statement regarding supervision by the cooperating teacher. The Administrative Code defines supervision compliance as the visitation by the college's supervisor which is a minimum of one visit every two weeks. The college's supervisors made the visits once every two weeks, therefore the college program is in compliance.

Table 5 represents the amount of good practice (Cooperman, 1986) used by the school district staff during supervision of the alternate teacher and of the student teachers.

Frequency of "Good Practice"
During Supervision

	Alternate Route Teachers	Student Teachers
# of Tching Days	1405 (100%)	841 (100%)
# of Pre-Ob Conferences	294 (11%)	553 (66%)
Received Critique	448 (32%)	624 (74%)
Ave Length of Critique	15 minutes	18 minutes
Mode of Length of Critique	0 minutes	12 minutes

Table 5

Row 1 shows the total number of days on which trainees taught. The numbers in row 2 represent the number of pre-observation conferences the trainees in each program received. Row 3 displays the number of critiques received by the trainees. The percentages were arrived at by assuming no more than one pre-observation conference or critique per day. This assumption was supported by the data. Row 4 shows the average length of a critique. Row 5 shows the mode, or the most frequent number in minutes appearing for a critique.

Provisional Teachers Instructional Meetings With the
Mentor Teacher, the Principal, and the Support Team

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4
Mentor, 1 or more Mtgs	24 (33%)	24 (33%)	24 (33%)	21 (29%)
Mentor, No Meetings	49 (67%)	49 (67%)	49 (67%)	52 (71%)
Principal, 1 or more Mtgs	36 (49%)	21 (29%)	21 (29%)	18(25%)
Principal, No Mtgs	43 (51%)	52 (71%)	52(71%)	55(75%)
Support Team, 1 or more Mtgs	1 (1%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)	0(0%)
Support Team No Meetings	72(99%)	71 (97%)	73 (100%)	73(100%)

Table 6

The school district staff responsible for conducting the teacher training program for the alternate route teacher is called the Support Team (New Jersey, 1988). The

team is charged to conduct the training/seminar aspect of the program (New Jersey Administrative Code 6:11-5.5). Table 6 represents the number of meetings the alternate route teachers had with individual members of the team and with the whole team. A seminar is required by the New Jersey Administrative Code. In addition to the above table, the data showed that 26 (36%) alternate route teachers reported never having met with their mentor teacher during the entire 20 day seminar/practicum training program; 30 (41%) reported that they had never met with their principal; and 17 (23%) reported that they had never met with anyone in the school district for training. By comparison, all 53 (100%) student teachers reported meeting with their cooperating teacher and with their college supervisors.

Observation of
Practicing Teachers

	Alt Rte	St. Tchrs
Obs Tchr	40 (55%)	53 (100%)
# of Periods	488	2641
No Tchr Ob'd	33 (45%)	0 (0%)

Table 7

Table 7 shows the number of provisional teachers and student teachers who were able to observe other teachers including their own mentor or cooperating teacher during the 20 day period. Row 1 reports the number and percentage of the N who observed other teachers. Row 2 displays the total number of periods in which the N observed other teachers. Row 3 shows the number of alternate route (33) and student teachers (0) who did not observe other teachers for even one period, including their own mentor or cooperating teacher, during the 20 day period of training.

Previous Teaching Experience of Provisional Teachers

Total	Yes	No	Yes P/T or Sub	Yes 1+Yr Exp	Total No Exp
134	71(52%)	63(47%)	52(73%)	19(14%)	115(86%)

Table 8

A second survey was given to Alternate Route instructors in which 134 chose to respond. Table 8 shows that 71 alternate route teachers claimed prior experience and 63 stated that they had no prior teaching experience. Column 4 shows that of the 71 who claimed previous teaching experience, 52 (73%) used part-time work of various types with youth and substitute teaching as a basis for previous experience. Column 5 shows that 19 (14%) who claimed prior experience had teaching jobs in which they

taught for at least one full year. Column 6 shows that 115 (86%) are categorized as having no prior teaching experience based on definition 7 (p.4) (Smith,1990).

Discussion

The data in this study were provided by approximately one (1) out of every four (4) alternate route teachers who entered the program during the Fall of 1989. The data were gathered by colleges operating centers in North, Central, and Southern New Jersey; Fairleigh Dickinson University, Kean College, Glassboro State College and Trenton State College. The alternate route teachers taught in wide variety of localities of schools, i.e. urban, suburban and rural; a wide variety of types of schools, private, parochial, and public; and a wide variety of level and subject matters, pre-k through grade 12 and early childhood, elementary, mathematics, physical and social sciences, language arts, music, art, and foreign languages. The backgrounds, educational levels, experience, ages, race, gender and ethnicity represent a wide cross-section of the alternate route population. It is reasonable to generalize the results of this sample to the population of New Jersey Alternate Route teachers.

The data for the student teaching population are localized to Trenton State College and represents a cross-section of student teachers in elementary and secondary education. The secondary disciplines represented are mathematics, physical sciences, social studies, and language arts. Elementary student teachers are involved in both primary and upper elementary teaching.

The New Jersey Administrative Code requires that the alternate route teacher be continuously supervised during the first twenty days of instruction. The intent of the first 20 days is to be a practicum/seminar in which the alternate route teacher is trained to assume full responsibility for a classroom. The design of the program requires that the novice teacher learn the pedagogic strategies specific to the grade level and/or discipline that the novice instructor is teaching from the field personnel in the practicum seminar. The importance of this discipline-specific pedagogic knowledge was pointed out in the search of the literature. A text which represents the body of this work is edited by Jere Brophy (1989). The training provided by the Mentor Teacher, the Principal, and the school based Support Team is the only training which is grade specific and content specific in the New Jersey program.

Table 1 shows that the Code and its intent have been violated for the vast majority of alternate route teachers; therefore the alternate route teachers are not receiving the training considered necessary to develop as a teacher according to the program design. Of the 6532 periods taught during this practicum/seminar, only 21%

were observed. The student teachers, who are not under this strict requirement, were observed almost 400% more (79%). The means of these two groups provide a meaningful comparison of different developmental strategies. The alternate route teacher is supposed to be gradually introduced into teaching full-time according to the program's Handbook. The maximum number of periods which could be taught in four weeks is 100 (4 wks X 25 pds/wk). The mean number (89) of periods taught during the 20 day practicum seminar for the alternate route teachers is equivalent to full-time teaching whereas the student teachers have a mean of 46 which was less than half of the practicum time spent in teaching. The student teachers were gradually inducted into the teaching process whereas the alternate route teachers began teaching immediately.

The immediacy and amount of teaching is an important distinction between these two practica. Current research has shown that novice teachers who are gradually inducted into the teaching process succeed better at learning how to teach than novice teachers who begin teaching full-time immediately (Borko & Livingston, 1989; Livingston & Borko, 1989; Griffin, 1985). This is a serious problem in the design of alternative certification programs. The severity of the distinction between the two programs is further shown in the mode of the percentage of instructional periods that were supervised. The mode, the most frequent percentage appearing for supervision of the alternate route teachers, was 0%. The mode for the supervision of the student teachers' instructional periods was 100%. The lack of an appropriate induction model for the novice teacher may impact upon student learning.

Table 2 shows that 49 (67%) of the alternate route teachers were not supervised on a daily basis when they taught while only two student teachers were not supervised daily. Three (4%) alternate route teachers were supervised 100% of the time which is the requirement, the other 70 (96%) were not. Only 9 (12%) alternate route teachers were supervised more than 50% of the time, the other 64 (88%) were observed less than 50% of the time when they taught. Forty-two (80%) student teachers, who are not under the same regulation, were supervised more than 50% of the time. Twenty-one (40%) were supervised every period (100%) they taught.

The Handbook (*New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program*, 1988) recommends that an inexperienced teacher not be permitted to teach a full day until the end of the second or third week. The development of the teacher is to be gradual, with the assumption of regular full-time duties in the fourth week. Table 3 shows us that 56 (77%) of the 73 alternate route teachers began teaching full-time in the first week, a clear violation of the Handbook and the intent of the New Jersey Administrative Code. Table 2 also shows that 17 (23%) of the alternate route teachers were never observed by anyone during the

entire 20 days. That is a clear violation of the New Jersey Administrative Code. Yet the State Department of Education provides life-time teaching certificates to 98% of everyone who enters the program (Kuhles, 1990). Table 7 data show that only 14% of the alternate route population have the requisite teaching experience, yet Table 3 shows that 77%, 80%, and 82% of the alternate route teachers are teaching full-time in weeks 1, 2, and 3 respectively. This is another violation of the Administrative Code.

A research study of the Texas alternate route program operated by the Dallas Independent School District provides a reasonable comparison with the New Jersey program in that the program designs have some basic similarities. The Dallas program began with 110 alternate route teachers who were selected after a nationwide advertising campaign. Of the 110 who began the program, 59 (54%)were certified at the end of the first year. The New Jersey Alternate Route boasts that 98% of everyone who began the program was certified at the end of one full year of teaching (Kuhles, 1990). The 98% certification rate is used by the New Jersey State Department of Education to prove the "success" of the program. Based on the research of the New Jersey program in this study plus the earlier study (Smith, 1990), and comparing the program to the Texas program, a different reasonable conclusion may be drawn: the New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program has standards so low or regulations so poorly enforced that it seems almost impossible for participants not to be certified.

Table 4 shows that there were no student teachers teaching full-time in the first week and only 4 in the second week even though they have had 360 more hours of field-experience preparation for student teaching than the alternate route teachers. All student teachers were observed during this 20 day period. Table 3 shows that in any given week, approximately 40% of the alternate route teachers will not be observed.

Table 3 shows that the greatest number of alternate route teachers in any one week of the study to be in compliance with the Code is 9 out of 73.

The State Department of Education has stressed the importance of good supervisory practices (Cooperman, 1986; Handbook, Appendix J, 1989). The data in Table 5 showed that very few of these good supervisory practices are being implemented in the training of alternate route teachers. The mentoring process implemented through supervision was non-existent for the great majority of alternate route teachers in this study. All 73 alternate route teachers taught, yet only 11% of the instructional days were preceded with a pre-observation conference; in contrast, the student teachers had pre-observation conferences for 66% of their instructional days. An application of the percentages to the 20 day practicum/seminar training program would mean that the alternate route teachers receive a pre-observation

conference once every two weeks. The student teachers would receive a critique seven times over a two week period. The critique, which is one of the primary instructional processes of an alternate route mentor teacher, was provided for 32% of the instructional days whereas the student teachers received a critique on 74% of their instructional days. The average length of the critiques is comparable at 15 and 18 minutes. Another significant comparison is the mode number of minutes for a critique. The most frequent number appearing for the number of minutes critiqued for alternate route teachers is 0. The most frequent number appearing for student teachers is 12. This further reinforces the previous data that the alternate route teachers have not received pedagogic training through their field work while student teachers are receiving professional support.

Table 6 focused upon the seminar component of the seminar/practicum requirement of the New Jersey Administrative Code. The Code is clear:

> (a) Each state-approved alternative training program shall provide essential knowledge and skills to provisional teachers through a full-time seminar/practicum of no less than 20 days duration which takes place prior to the time at which the provisional teacher takes full responsibility for a classroom. This seminar/practicum shall provide formal instruction in the essential areas for professional study[,] produce basic teaching skills through supervised teaching experiences with students. The seminar and practicum components of the experience shall be integrated and shall include an orientation to the policies, organization, and curriculum of the employing district (6:11-5.5).

Table 6 shows that in the first week 49 (67%) alternate route teachers did not meet even once with their mentor, 43 (51%) never met their principal, and 72 (99%) had no seminar. This is repeated each week until the third and fourth week when no alternate route teacher had a seminar with the Support Team. In addition, 26 (36%) of the alternate route teachers never met with their mentor teacher; 30 (41%) never met with the principal, and 17 (23%) never met with anyone. This is in violation of the Code's literal requirements and certain in the intent. The importance of the lack of contact with the field-based trainers is increased when the program design shows this component to be the only place where the alternate route teacher will receive discipline specific and/or grade specific methodologies. The importance of pedagogic knowledge and skill has been correlated with student achievement gains. The lack of training of the teacher may be reflected in pupil achievement performance (Hawk, 1985).

The interpretation of the intent of the Administrative Code and Handbook for the alternate route was conducted by two separate panels of school district administrators and teachers who had worked with the alternate route.

Table 7 provides the last analysis of training. Both groups are supposed to observe their mentor and other teachers performing in the classroom. The data shows that all student teachers and 55% of the alternate route teachers did this. However, 53 student teacher performed 5.5 times as many observations as the 73 alternate route teachers (2641 student teacher observations versus 488 alternate route teacher observations).

The dramatic discrepancies in the data are even more startling when it is realized that many of the school districts which work with the alternate route were also working with the College's student teaching program. The data suggest that much of the fault with the New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program is in its design. Although Commissioner Cooperman has a school district background, the program design does not consider the constraints under which school districts operate, especially urban districts who are the heaviest program users (Provisional Teacher, 1989). The program predicates that school districts will have the financial resources, available staff, and additional time to conduct novice teacher training completely on their own while school is in session. To expect this of school districts, especially large urban districts, is at best naive. The data in this study and the earlier study (Smith, 1990) showed that in three of the five years the New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program has operated, the vast majority of the alternate route teachers have not received their field-based professional training.

Conclusions

The primary conclusion which can be drawn is that for the vast majority of alternate route teachers, the 20 day practicum/seminar training program is very close to non-existent. The program as a whole is clearly in violation of its own training requirements. Were the New Jersey State Department of Education to have this program assessed by an external accreditation group, the alternate route program would surely fail. If the New Jersey State Department of Education assessed the program against its own standards, the program would fail.

The second conclusion which might be drawn is that school districts are able to provide the support and training for people preparing to be teachers in the student teaching program but are not able to do so with the alternate route program. The differences in training compliance are dramatic and substantial. The reasons for it are

not completely clear. The primary differences seem to be that the student teacher is assigned to work with experienced teachers and is never expected to take an instructional assignment as a colleague during this experience, whereas this instructional assignment is precisely what is expected of the alternate route teacher. Another primary difference is that the college supervisor is visiting every two weeks, therefore the program has constant monitoring external to the school site. There is no constant external monitoring of the alternate route program in the school district. A third difference is that the student teachers have had extensive professional preparation prior to student teaching whereas the alternate route teachers have had none. The fourth difference is that the College's programs undergo external evaluation on a regular basis. The conclusion which might be drawn is that school districts may not be appropriate organizations to be the sole conductor of novice teacher education for the initial certificate.

References

Adelman, Nancy, et al (1986, October). *An Exploratory Study of Teacher Alternative Certification and Retraining Programs*, Washington, D.C., Dept. of Education.

Alternatives, Yes. Lower Standards, No! Minimum Standards for Alternative Teacher Certification Programs (1989). Reston, VA: Association for Teacher Educators.

Ashburn, Elizabeth (1984, Feb).*Emergency Teacher Certification ERIC Digest.*, washington, D.C. ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Banks, S. & Necco, E. (1986, Sum) Alternative Certification, Educational Training, and Job Longevity. *Action in Teacher Education* 8 (2) 67-73.

Borko, Hilda and Livingston, Carol (1989, Winter). Cognition and Improvisation: Differences in Mathematics Instruction by Expert and Novice Teachers. *American Education Research Journal*, 26 (4) 473-498.

Boyer, Ernest, Chair (1984, March). *Report of a Panel on the Preparation of Beginning Teachers*. Trenton: New Jersey State Department of Education.

Brophy, Jere ed. (1989). *Advances in Research on Teaching, Volume 1* ,Greenwich, CT.: JAI Press Inc.

Cooperman, S. (1986, October). *New Jersey's Plan for the Supervision of Instruction,* (pp. 12,13). Trenton: New Jersey State Department of Education.

Cooperman, S. (1983, September). *An Alternative Route to Teacher Selection and Professional Quality Assurance: An Analysis of Initial Certification.* Trenton: New Jersey State Department of Education.

Cooperman, Saul and Klagholz, Leo (1985, June). New Jersey's Alternate Route to Certification. *Phi Delta Kappan* 66 (10) 691-695.

Culver, et al (1986, Summer) Confronting the Teacher Shortage: Are Alternative Certification Programs the Answer? *Action in Teacher Education 8 (2) 19-23.*

Darling-Hammond, Linda and Berry, Barnett ((1988). *The Evolution of Teacher Policy.* Santa Monica, CA: Center for Policy Research in Education, Rand Corporation.

Darling-Hammond, Linda; Hudson, Lisa, and Kirby, Shiela (1989). *Redesigning Teacher Education. Opening the Door for New Recruits to Science and Mathematics Teaching.* Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Denton, Jon and Smith, Nick (1984, April). *A Cost Effectiveness Evaluation of Alternate Secondary Level Teacher Preparation Programs.* New Orleans, LA: paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Durkin, L & Smith, J.M. (1981, July) A Challenge for the Leadership of Teacher Education in the Eighties. *Peabody Journal of Education* 58 (4) 183-188.

ERIC identifiers used in the search were Alternative Certification, Alternative Teacher Certification, Emergency Certification, Teacher Education, Teacher Certification, ERIC Digests, Educational Certificates, State Programs, Internship Programs, Non-traditional Education.

Friendly, Jonathon (1986, June) Alternate Route Teacher assailed Over Error of $400, *New York Times.*

Galluzzo, G & Ritter, D. (1986, Summer) Identifying Standards for Alternate Route Programs. *Action in Teacher Education* 8 (2) 59-65.

Graham, P. & Million, S. (1986, November). *Overcoming Teacher Shortages: the South Carolina Alternative Certification Program.* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council of States on In-service Education, Denver.

Gray, D & Lynn, D (1988) *New Teacher, Better Teachers: A Report of Two Initiatives in New Jersey.* Council for Basic Education, Washington, D.C., p.8.

Griffin, G. (1985, Jan-Feb) Induction. *Journal of Teacher Education* 36 (1) 42-46.

Haberman, Martin (1984, September) *An Evaluation of the Rationale for Required Teacher Education: Beginning Teachers With and Without Teacher Preparation.* Prepared for the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education,

Hawk, Parmalee; Coble, Charles; & Swanson, Melvin (1985, May/June). Certification, It Does Matter *Journal of Teacher Education*, 7 (3) 13-15.

Hill, Betty (1980, June) *The Development and Implementation of a Staff Development Program for Uncertified Teachers in the Field of Early Childhood Education.* Broward Cty, FL. Nova University practicum paper.

Huling-Austin, L. (1986, Summer) Factors To Be Considered in Alternative Certification Programs. What Can Be Learned From Teacher Induction Research?. *Action in Teacher Education* 8 (2) 51-57.

Hunt, Walter (1987). *Teaching and Learning in the Affective Domain: A Review of the Literature.* Olympia, WA: Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Kuhles, B(1990, Feb. 19)*Alternate Route Training Lacking* .Passaic,NJ Herald & News,p.1.

Livingston, C. & Borko, H. (1989). Expert-Novice Differences in Teaching: A Cognitive Analysis and Implications for Teacher Education *Journal of Teacher Education* 40 (4) 36-42

Lutz, Frank and Hutton, Jerry (1989, Fall). Alternative Teacher Certification. Its Policy Implications for Classroom Personnel Practice. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11 (3) 237-254.

Medley, Donald (1985, April). *Issues and Problems in the Validation of teaching and Teacher Professional Behavior.* Chicago,IL: paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Miller, Priscilla (1981, April). *The Effects of Behavior Model Analysis on Teachers Behaviors During Science Activity Lessons.* Ellenville, NY : paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching.

New Jersey Administrative Code (1985, October) 6:11-5.5. Trenton.

New Jersey Provisional Teacher Program: Handbook for State Approved Programs (1988, July). Trenton: New Jersey State Department of Education

NJEA "We Think Its News" press release,6/4/86, Trenton, NJ.

Oliver, B & McKibbin, M (1985). Teacher Trainees: Alternative Credentialing in California. *Journal of Teacher Education* 36 (3) 20-23.

Provisional Teacher Program: PSA Survey Results (1986) Trenton: New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association.

Reforms/Change in Teacher Education, 1985-1988 (1989, February 3) Washington, D.C., American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Reynolds, Maynard (Ed) (1989). *Knowledge Base for the Beginning Teacher.* New York, Pergamom Press.

Rosenshine, Barak (1983, March). Teaching Functions in Instructional Programs; *Elementary School Journal* , 83 (4), 335-51.

Roth, R. (1986, Sum) Alternate and Alternative Certification: Purposes, Assumptions, Implications. *Action in Teacher Education* 8 (2) 1-5.

Saunders, Robert and Smith, Dennis (1986, March) *An Alternative Teacher Preparation and Certification Program (Lyndhurst Program).* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago.

Smith, J. M. (1990, February). *School Districts As Teacher Training Institutions in the New Jersey Alternate Route Program.* Clearwater, Florida: Eastern Educational Research Association.

Teacher Certification , 1986-1988 (1989, February, 2) Washington, D.C., American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Teacher Interns and Internship Programs, 1978-1988 (1989, February 3) Washington, D.C., American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

The Provisional Teacher Program, Fourth Year Report (1988, December). Trenton: New Jersey State Department of Education.

The Provisional Teacher Program, Fifth Year Report (1989, December). Trenton: New Jersey State Department of Education.

Van der Sijde, Pieter (1987, April). *The Effect of Short Teacher Training on Students' Learning Outcomes*. Washington, DC: paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Williamson, James, et al (1984, February). *Emergency Teacher Certification*, paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, San Antonio.

APPENDIX A

1. DIRECTIONS FOR WEEKLY LOG, 1989
3 WEEKLY LOG, 1989

Direction for Provisional Teacher's
Weekly Log

Enclosed is a Weekly Log for following your development as a teacher. The purpose of the log is to identify the factors at school which have helped you to become a good teacher during the first phase of your training. It will then be possible to help others who enter the program in the future to become good teachers.

Please select your own four digit number to identify your log; e.g. your birth date, the last four digits of your Social Security number. Place it at the top of each weekly log. This will permit us to follow your experiences while providing you with total anonymity.

A key code has been provided so that the log can be kept on one sheet of paper for each week.

DIRECTIONS

Line 1. Please list the number of classes or the approximate amount of time in minutes that you taught. Include all classes, even those in which you taught part of the time.

Line 2 If you observed other teachers today, indicate the number of periods or the approximate amount of time in minutes that you spent observing. If you did no observing, place a "0."

If you were given specific aspects of teaching to observe, please write an "S" in the space. If it was a general observation, please write a "G".

Line 3.0 If you were observed by anyone today, please write in the number of periods or the amount of time. If you were not observed today, place a "--" sign in the space

3.1 If you talked about the lesson ahead of time with the person observing you, place a check in 3.1 "Pre-Ob" If you did not have a conference, write in "0".

3.2 Please list the position of the person observing you: M=Cooperating Teacher; T=any other teacher; C=College Supervisor; A= School Administrator.

Line 4. If you discussed your lesson with the observer after you taught it, please estimate the length of time of the conference. If you were not critiqued afterwards by your observer, please write in "0". If you were critiqued the following day, please enter the time as though it happened that day but put an "N" after the time.

Line 5. If you participated in formal meetings at the school with your cooperating teacher and/or others regarding teaching, please check here and complete this section. These meetings would be in addition to a specific lesson critique. The meetings might be about unit planning, daily and weekly planning, how to discipline, curriculum, etc.

5.1 In "Position" list the position(s) of the people who met with you that day. Use the key code from Line 3.2.

5.2 Enter the letter(s) that best describe(s) the major subject of your meeting: M=Methods; D=Discipline; C=Content; T=Tests/Student Evaluation; G=Grading; S=School Rules; R=Classroom Management; Q=Questioning Strategies; U=Unrelated to your teaching.

5.3 Enter the approximate length of the meeting in minutes.

5.4 If the meeting was helpful, enter a "3"; if the meeting was neither helpful nor non-helpful, enter a "2"; if the meeting was not helpful or confusing, enter a "1"

Line 6.0 Enter the amount of time you spent at school after the official time you are permitted to leave.

Line 7. Enter the amount of time spent of school work at home. This includes everything from lesson planning through the grading of homework.

Line 8. What other help was offered at school and was it useful. Try to be specific.

Line 9. What help would you have liked but did not receive.

Line 10. Enter a "3" if you feel you are doing a superior job; a "2" if you feel adequate about your work; and a "1" if you feel frustrated or overwhelmed.

Verbal Directions

We need to find out what is going on in the program so that we can build a better Alternate Route for the next group of people. The 80 hour academic program you are beginning now, used to take place in a five week period. Because of the documented complaints, the time was extended to nine weeks. What you put on these forms can make a difference.

This form will not take you long to fill --possibly a few minutes each day or a few minutes at the end of the week. I suggest you keep it on your night stand and when you go to bed each night, sit down and complete the form. Or keep it in your brief case and just before you leave school each day, sit down and fill out the form. It may help you reflect on your day and put it into proper perspective.

Let's read the top part of the form together and then I'll help you with the rest.

Let's fill out the first week together. Line 1 says, "Classes/Time taught." That means to list the amount of time you taught in minutes if you were an elementary teacher. You may teach 20 minutes of one class, 15 minutes of another, or you may teach all day. Whatever the minutes are, add them up and enter that here. Try to be as accurate as you can. If you are a secondary teacher, list the number of periods that you taught--1, 2, 3, etc. If you are teaching full time, put in a 5.

Line 2 is "Observation." This means whether you observed another instructor teaching, even if it's the person working with you in your classroom. Again, list the number of minutes or the periods in which you did this.

There is a second part to this. Please write and "S" if you were told to look for something specific such as "See how the teacher begins class," or "Look for how she handles discipline problems," or "How she manages the classroom." If you were told to go into the classroom and pick up what you can or were told nothing, enter a "Y". The S stands for Structured observation and the U stands for Unstructured observation.

Line 3 is Observed. If you were observed once, put a check mark here. If you were observed more often, then put in the number of periods or minutes. Observed does not just mean someone sitting in the back of the room watching you teach. If there is another teacher assigned to you who is in the room, even though you are both teaching, or the person may be grading papers or writing curriculum, this is still observation. You should fill in the number of periods or amount of time the person is with you. Any person assigned to be with you in the room who is there is considered an observer.

Line 3.1 is "Pre-Ob." This just means if you talked about the lesson ahead of time with your teacher, principal, or whoever is observing you, even if it was for 30 seconds, place a check mark. We do not care about the length of the conference, we care about whether someone talked with you about your lesson before you taught it.

Line 3.2 is "Position." You'll see in the directions a list of possible people who might have observed you. T means any teacher. If you have a supervisor, which you will if you are a secondary teacher, use the S.. Some of the elementary teachers will also have supervisors but it's not as likely. If it is the vice principal, use the VP initials for him.

Line 4 wants to find out about your conferences following the lesson. If someone critiqued you, put that length of time in here. If they observed you on Monday, but you did not talk about it until Thursday, list that meeting as an instructional meeting. Critiques can only take place the day of the observation or the day after, the next day following, the observation. All others should be listed as instructional meetings.

If I observe you on Monday and then talk with you about it on Tuesday, list the critique time as though everything happened on Monday.

Line 5 means any meeting you may have attended which was meant to improve your instruction. If you were told to attend a workshop, the workshop would also be an instructional meeting.
Line 5.1 wants you to list the positions of the people who met with you. Please not that W for the Whole Team. If your Support Team met with you as a team, use this code. Everyone does not have to be present, but most of the members should be there. We want to now if a team met with you.

Line 5.2. Look through the list and place the major topic or purpose of the meaning. If there was more than one, list them but try to keep it to three.

Line 5.3 wants the number of minutes you met with this team.

Line 5.4 is looking for your own opinion. Do you believe the meeting was helpful.

Line 6 has to do with the amount of time spent after school. If school ends at 2:45 but you are required to stay at school until 3:15, do not start counting your time after school or staying late until after 3:15. If you stay until 4:00, the time you would enter is 45 minutes. That is, from 3:15 until 4:00.

Line 7 merely wants the amount of time you spent at home working on school work. Remember, thinking time counts. Please note that there is a week-end part to the log. Please place your week-end time here. If you grade papers on Saturday and write lesson plans on Sunday, all that time spent should be entered here.

Line 8 wants to know what other help was provided for you by the school that was not coded already. For example, a librarian may have helped you plan a lesson or a school psychologists may have helped you work with one of your students more effectively.

Line 9 would like to know what help you wanted or would like to have had that day or that week but you did not receive. This will help us to plan support services we may not have thought of yet.

Line 10 is to be an honest of reflection of how you felt at the end of the day. Try to remember each day and how you felt when you went home. Of you felt terrific and said to yourself, "I did a really good job today," put a plus sign. If you felt adequate, that you did a good or OK job today, put in a check mark. If you felt frustrated or overwhelmed, or ask yourself if you really wanted to be a teacher, put in a 0.

WEEK # _____ WEEKLY LOG Date_____

ACTIVITY	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Weekends
1. Classes/time taught						
2. Observation						
3. Observed						
3.1 Pre-Ob						
3.2 position						
4. Critique						
5. Instructional Mtgs.						
5.1 Position						
5.2 Type						
5.3 Length						
5.4 Helpful						
6. Stayed Late						
7. Homework						
8. Other Help						
9. Help Desired						
10. Self-Rating						

WEEK # _____ WEEKLY LOG Date_____

ACTIVITY	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Weekends
1. Classes/time taught						
2. Observation						
3. Observed						
3.1 Pre-Ob						
3.2 position						
4. Critique						
5. Instructional Mtgs.						
5.1 Position						
5.2 Type						
5.3 Length						
5.4 Helpful						
6. Stayed Late						
7. Homework						
8. Other Help						
9. Help Desired						
10. Self-Rating						

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Education
Research and
Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed

March 21,1991